

the problems of decolonization. It has outlived its purpose. Rather than search for a new purpose for this Council, we should ask whether it should exist at all.

Mr. President, the other major area for reform is in our thinking about what the United Nations is and what its role should be in American foreign policy. We cannot expect the United Nations to be clearer in purpose than is its most powerful member state.

At its core, the United Nations is a collection of sovereign states and is beholden to them for guidance, funding, and, ultimately, legitimacy. The political decisions that drive the Organization and define its proper role in international politics must be made in national capitals, not in New York.

I have grown increasingly concerned about the tendency toward a fuzzy multilateralism that has come to mark U.N. policy toward the United Nations. We have shown a penchant for dumping difficult problems in the lap of the United Nations and then complaining when no solution is forthcoming. The tragedy in former Yugoslavia may be the most dramatic current example of this phenomena. The truth is, we cannot so easily wash our hands of difficult decisions.

The United Nations is not a substitute for American leadership in international affairs. Rather, it is one avenue available to exercise that leadership.

I believe we must own up to the truth about our role in the United Nations. The United Nations has many failures, but we fool ourselves if we merely point fingers at New York and blame the United Nations for its shortcomings. The United States is first among equals in the U.N. system. The failures of the United Nations are, in reality, our own.

We would do well to reflect honestly on that unavoidable truth. On this golden anniversary, we must decide whether we will continue to muddle along, or whether the United States once again will assume its unique mantle of leadership at the United Nations. I, for one, believe we must lead.

CONGRATULATING THE SOUTH AFRICAN RUGBY TEAM

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, on Saturday South Africa defeated heavily favored New Zealand in the world rugby championship. I rise today to congratulate the South African rugby team, as well as the people of South Africa, on this historic victory.

For years, because of its apartheid policies, South Africa has stood on the outside of international sports competitions. From the Olympics to the World Cup, South Africa—a country of intense sports fans—had become isolated and banned from many competitions. And more than most other sports, rugby had become closely associated with the former white government and its apartheid policies.

After this history, the image of President Nelson Mandela—a man imprisoned for 27 years in his fight against apartheid—handing the World Cup trophy to the white captain of the rugby team is indeed a powerful symbol of the dramatic changes in South Africa. Throughout the country, whites and blacks alike celebrated the victory of the Springboks, the mascot of the national team.

Mr. President, I join with the international community in congratulating the people of South Africa on winning the rugby World Cup. It has been a dramatic and historic time in South Africa. This victory, bringing together all South Africans, exemplifies the progress to date and the hope for the future of a great country.

CYBERPORN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there is an article from Time magazine and an article from the Spectator magazine that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this morning I want to speak on a topic that has received a lot of attention around here lately. My topic is cyberporn, and that is, computerized pornography. I have introduced S. 892, entitled the Protection of Children from Computer Pornography Act of 1995.

This legislation is narrowly drawn. It is meant to help protect children from sexual predators and exposure to graphic pornography.

Mr. President, Georgetown University Law School has released a remarkable study conducted by researchers at Carnegie Mellon University. This study raises important questions about the availability and the nature of cyberporn. It is this article I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

Later on, on this subject, some time during the middle of July, I will be conducting hearings before the full Judiciary Committee to fully and completely explore these issues. In the meantime, I want to refer to the Carnegie Mellon study, and I want to emphasize that this is Carnegie Mellon University. This is not a study done by some religious organization analyzing pornography that might be on computer networks.

The university surveyed 900,000 computer images. Of these 900,000 images, 83.5 percent of all computerized photographs available on the Internet are pornographic. Mr. President, I want to repeat that: 83.5 percent of the 900,000 images reviewed—these are all on the Internet—are pornographic, according to the Carnegie Mellon study.

Now, of course, that does not mean that all of these images are illegal under the Constitution. But with so many graphic images available on com-

puter networks, I believe Congress must act and do so in a constitutional manner to help parents who are under assault in this day and age. There is a flood of vile pornography, and we must act to stem this growing tide, because, in the words of Judge Robert Bork, it incites perverted minds. I refer to Judge Bork from the Spectator article that I have permission to insert in the RECORD.

My bill, again, is S. 892, and provides just this sort of constitutional, narrowly focused assistance in protecting children, while also protecting the rights of consenting adults to transmit and receive protected pornographic material—protected, that is, under the first amendment.

Also, according to the Carnegie Mellon University study, cyberporn is really big business. Some computer networks which specialize in computer pornography take in excess of \$1 million per year.

Later this week, I am going to introduce the Antielectronic Racketeering Act of 1995 which will target organized crime which has begun to use the awesome powers of computers to engage in criminal activity.

As we all know from past debates in this body, organized crime is heavily involved in trafficking illegal pornography. The Antielectronic Racketeering Act will put a dent into that.

In closing, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give this study by Carnegie Mellon University serious consideration, and I urge my colleagues to support S. 892. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Spectator, Feb. 4, 1995]

AN ELECTRONIC SINK OF DEPRAVITY

NEW YORK.—If last year it was merely modish to be seen speeding down the information superhighway, this year it is fast becoming essential, at least in America. Hitch your wagon to cyberspace, says the new Speaker of the House, Mr. Newt Gingrich, and your democracy will become absolute, with all America joined together for the first time into one vast and egalitarian town meeting.

Mr. Gingrich made this all clear two weeks ago when he unveiled a new system for bringing Congress to the electronically connected populace, which in honour of President Jefferson is called "Thomas". Anyone with a computer and a modem at home or in the office (or even up in the skies, courtesy of USAir's new back-of-the-seat telescopes) may now, with only the click of a few buttons, find the text of any bill, any resolution, any government statement.

Mr. Gingrich is hugely excited by this idea—going so far as to suggest, and not at all facetiously, that perhaps every citizen be given a thousand-dollar tax deduction to allow him to buy himself a laptop computer. Thus will all America be conjoined, he argues, and thus will its democracy be ever strengthened as in no other country on earth.

Fine, say I, and not just because I will become richer by \$1,000. For the last three years or so I have been a dedicated and enthusiastic user of the Internet. (The Internet—"the net" to those in the know—began innocently enough 20 years ago as a vast worldwide network of computers, linked together by government-funded telephone

lines, with high-powered government-funded "exchanges" to speed calls on their way, which enabled universities and governments to swap information. Five years or so ago, its controllers opted to make it more democratic, and now anyone is able to connect to it; tens of thousands of new subscribers join every day, and the net is becoming truly global, with at least 20 million regular users.)

I am a typical enough user. I send electronic mail—e-mail—to everyone who is similarly hooked up (it is lightning fast and essentially free); and I browse through the world's libraries and data-bases to do research for whatever book I happen to be writing. I bask happily in the Panglossian principle that the Internet seems to enshrine. By virtue of the net, I have complete freedom to explore and trawl for anything I want in what has become by custom an untrammelled, uncontrolled, wholly liberated ocean of information. The Internet seems and sounds to be something almost noble. One can understand why the US Congress named its own portion of the net after Jefferson: all knowledge there is on hand for all the people—just the kind of thing the great man would have liked.

But this week, while I was peering into an area of the Internet where I have hitherto not lingered, I discovered something so appalling as to put all such high-minded sentiments into a quite different perspective.

I had stumbled, not entirely accidentally, into a sinkhole of electronic but very real perversion. The first thing I read, almost as soon as I entered it, was a lengthy, very graphic and in stylistic terms quite competently composed narrative that presented in all its essentials the story of a kidnapping, and the subsequent rape, torture, mutilation and eventual murder of the two victims. That author called himself by a code-name, Blackwind; and while it is quite likely that he is American, almost as certain that he is well-educated and quite possible that he is at least a peripheral member of the academic community, we know, and are allowed to know, nothing else about him.

His anonymity is faultlessly safeguarded by a system of electronics which has been built into the Internet, and which even the police and the other agents of the state are unable, technically or in law, to penetrate. This is, from their point of view, highly regrettable. Blackwind's offerings—and the very similar stories currently being published on the Internet by scores of men who are in all likelihood as deranged as he seems to be—should be subject to some kind of legal sanction, and for one very understandable reason: the victims of the story he has written are small children.

One is a six-year old boy named Christopher, who, among other indignities, suffers a castration—reported in loving detail—before being shot. The other is a girl named Karen, who is seven years old and is raped repeatedly by no fewer than nine men, before having her nipples cut off and her throat slashed.

At the moment of my writing this, I find that there are perhaps 200 similar stories presently circulating and available on one of the so-called "newsgroups" on the Internet. The choice of tales is endlessly expanded and refreshed by new and ever more exotic stories that emerge into this particular niche in the other every day, almost every hour. You want tales of fathers sodomizing their three-year-old daughters, or of mothers performing fellatio on their prepubescent sons, or of girls coupling with horses, or of the giving of enemas to child virgins? Then you need do no more than visit the newsgroup that is named "alt.sex.stories" and all will reliably be there, 24 hours a day, for everyone with a

computer and a telephone, anywhere on (or above) the face of the earth.

There are about 5,000 separate newsgroups on the net, each one of them presenting chatter about some scintilla of human knowledge or endeavour. I have long liked the system, and found it an agreeable way to discover people around the world who have similar interests. I used to tell others who were not yet signed up to the net that using newsgroups was like going into a hugely crowded pub, finding in milliseconds those who wanted to talk about what you wanted to know, having a quick drink with them before leaving, without once having encountered a bore.

And so, with an alphabetical list running from 'ab.fen'—which shows you how much fun you can have in Alberta—down to something in German called 'zer.zmetz.Wissenschaft.physik', the enthusiasms of the world's Internet-connected population are distilled into their electronic segments. Alberta-philes can chat with each other, as can German physicists, and those who would bore these are left to chat among themselves. In theory, an admirable arrangement.

By Jeffersonian rights it should be uplifting to the spirit. In reality it is rather less so. In far too many groups the level of discussion is execrable and juvenile. Arguments break out, insults are exchanged, the chatter drifts aimlessly in and out of relevance. This is a reality of the electronic world that few like to admit. It is prompting many browsers to suspect, as I do, that a dismayingly large number of users of this system are not at all the kind of sturdy champions of freedom and democracy and intellect that Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Gore would like them to be.

More probably, to judge from the tone and the language in many of the groups, they are pasty-faced and dysfunctional men with halitosis who inhabit damp basements. And it is for them, in large measure, that the newsgroups whose titles begin with the code-letters 'alt.sex' seem to exist.

There are 55 of these, offering manna for all diets. Some are fairly light-hearted; 'alt.sex.anal', for example contains much spirited chat about amusing uses to which you can put the colonic gateway; 'alt.sex.voyeurism' seems to contain reasonably harmless chatter between a whole worldful of civic-minded Peeping Toms, who like to advise one another which public loos in which national parks have eye-sized knotholes in their doors. There is also 'alt.sex.nasal.hair', into which I have not thus far been tempted.

There are a number of the groups, though, which are not so amusing. There is 'alt.sex.intergen', where the last letters stand for 'intergenerational', which is the current paedophile bulletin-board; and there is my current target, 'alt.sex.stories'. I came across it by accident, and I double-clicked my mouse to open it, briefly enthralled. It did not take many seconds before I realized I had been ill-prepared for what was on offer.

There is a kind of classification system. Each story entry lists a title, an author (invariably either a pseudonym, or posted via an anonymous computer that has laundered the words and made the detection of the author impossible), and a series of code-words and symbols that indicate the approximate content.

Blackwind's many offerings—there were about 200 stories in all, with Blackwind contributing perhaps 15 of them—usually fell into the categories that are denoted by the codes 'm-f, f-f, scat.pedo.snuff', meaning that they contain scenes of male-female sex, female-female sex, scatological imagery, paedophilia description and the eventual killing of the central victim. You quickly

get, I think, the drift. Others are more horrifying still—those that end with the invariable 'snuff' scene, but whose enticements on the way include 'best', 'torture', 'gore' or 'amputees', and which refer to sex with animals, bloodlettings, sadistic injury, and the limitless erotic joy of stumps.

It is important to note that no one polices or, to use the Internet word, 'moderates', this group. (Some of the more obscure and non-sexual newsgroups do have a volunteer, usually a specialist in the field, who tries to keep order in what might, if unchecked, become an unruly discussion.) On 'alt.sex.stories' there is only one man, a Mr. Joshua Laff of the University of Illinois at Urbana, who oversees the group, in a somewhat lethargic way. He helpfully suggests the code-words for the various kinds of perverse interests. He indicates to people who want to talk about sex stories, rather than actually contributing them, that they would be better advised to post their gripes on 'alt.sex.stories.discussion', next door, and so on.

But Mr. Laff has no admitted scruples about what is permitted to go out over the air. So far as he is concerned, the First Amendment to the Constitution protects all that is said on 'alt.sex.stories' as free speech. What is demonstrated on these thousands of electronic pages is a living exhibition of the birthright of all who are fortunate enough to be born in the land that has given us the National Rifle Association, the Reverend Jimmy Swaggart, and Blackwind.

In truth, Mr. Laff and those who support the published existence of such writings are technically right. No obscene pictures are published—these could be banned in law. No obscene truths are proffered, so far as we know—no confessions of real rapes, nor of actual acts of pederasty. And since all the stories are prefaced with warnings that those under 18, or those of sensitive disposition, should read no further—devices that presumably attract precisely those they purport to deter—so, the authors seem to agree, their ramblings do no harm at all.

Most individual states legislate firmly or less so against printed pornography; but so far no one has successfully prosecuted the Internet—not least for the reason that with so amorphous, so global and so informal a linking of computers, who out there can be held responsible? People like Blackwind simply open accounts at what are known as 'anonymous posting systems', and their words become filtered through two or three computers in such a way that the original source can never be known, and the perpetrator of any possible crime becomes impossible to find. And, anyway, those who endlessly cry First Amendment! Here we want to say that the publishing of more words, even those from so clearly depraved an individual as Blackwind, can do no harm at all.

Commonsense would argue otherwise. A long and graphic account of exactly how and at what hour you wait outside a girls' school, how best to bundle a seven-year-old into your van, whether to tell her at the start of her ordeal that she is going to be killed at the end of it (Blackwind's favoured *modus operandi*), how best to tie her down, which aperture to approach first, and with what—such things can only tempt those who verge on such acts to take a greater interest in them.

Surely such essays tell the thinker of forbidden thoughts that there exists somewhere out there a like-minded group of men for whom such things are really not so bad, the enjoyment of which, if no one is so ill-starred as to get caught, can be limitless. Surely it is naive folly—or, at the other end of the spectrum, gross irresponsibility—to suppose otherwise.

Such material is not, I am happy to say, universally available. Some of the big corporations which offer public access to the Internet—America On-Line, CompuServe, Prodigy, Mr. Murdoch's Delphi—have systems in place that filter out the more objectionable newsgroups. On America On-Line you may read the ramblings on 'alt.sex.voyeurism' and probably even 'alt.sex.nasal.hair', but you may read no 'alt.sex.stories', nor may you learn techniques for having real relationships, as paedophiles like to say they have, with young children.

But for those with the wherewithal to find more robust and uncontrolled access to cyberspace—and that means, quite frankly, most of the world's computer users, be they 90 years old or nine—all newsgroups are equally available, the evil along with the excellent. The question we have to ask is whether that should continue to be the case.

One might not mind so much if the material were being confined to the United States, where most of it originates. But in fact it manages to seep its electronic way everywhere, from Wiltshire to Waziristan. And crucially, no mechanism is yet in place allowing foreigners—whose laws might well be far less tolerantly disposed to it—to filter it out.

A computer owner in Islington or Islamabad can have easy and inexpensive access to material over the net which would be illegal for him or her to read or buy on any British or Pakistani street. In China, pornographers would be imprisoned for publishing material that any Peking University students can read at the click of a mouse; and the same is true in scores of other countries and societies. The Internet, we smugly say, has become a means of circumventing the restrictive codes of tyrannies. But the reverse of this coin is less attractive; it also allows an almost exclusively American contagion to ooze outwards, unstoppable, like an oil spill, contaminating everyone and everything in its path.

We cannot, of course, prevent such things being thought. We may not prevent them being written for self-gratification alone. But, surely, science and the public can somehow conspire and co-operate to see that such writings as are represented by 'scat.pedo.torture.snuff' and the like are neither published nor read, and that they do not in consequence have the opportunity to spread outwards as an electronic contagion from the minds of those who, like Blackwind, first create them.

The Jeffersonian model for universal freedom which Mr. Gingrich so rightly applauds could not take into account the barbarisms of the modern mind. Nor could it imagine the genius by which such barbarisms can be disseminated as they are today, in seconds, to the remotest and still most innocent corners of the world. Someone, perhaps even the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is going to have to consider soon the implications, for ill as well as good, of our venture out onto the information superhighway, or else there are going to be some very messy electronic traffic accidents.

[From Time Magazine, June 1995]

CYBERPORN—ON A SCREEN NEAR YOU

(By Philip Elmer-Dewitt)

It's popular, pervasive and surprisingly perverse, according to the first survey of on-line erotica. And there's no easy way to stamp it out.

Sex is everywhere these days—in books, magazines, films, television, music videos and bus-stop perfume ads. It is printed on dial-a-porn business cards and slipped under windshield wipers. It is acted out by balloon-

breasted models and actors with unflagging erections, then rented for \$4 a night at the corner video store. Most Americans have become so inured to the open display of eroticism—and the arguments for why it enjoys special status under the First Amendment—that they hardly notice it's there.

Something about the combination of sex and computers, however, seems to make otherwise worldly-wise adults a little crazy. How else to explain the uproar surrounding the discovery by a U.S. Senator—Nebraska Democrat James Exon—that pornographic pictures can be downloaded from the Internet and displayed on a home computer? This, as any computer-savvy undergrad can testify, is old news. Yet suddenly the press is on alert, parents and teachers are up in arms, and lawmakers in Washington are rushing to ban the smut from cyberspace with new legislation—sometimes with little regard to either its effectiveness or its constitutionality.

If you think things are crazy now, though, wait until the politicians get hold of a report coming out this week. A research team at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has counted an exhaustive study of online porn—what's available, who is downloading it, what turns them on—and the findings (to be published in the *Georgetown Law Journal*) are sure to pour fuel on an already explosive debate.

The study, titled *Marketing Pornography on the Information Superhighway*, is significant not only for what it tells us about what's happening on the computer networks but also for what it tells us about ourselves. Pornography's appeal is surprisingly elusive. It plays as much on fear, anxiety, curiosity and taboo as on genuine eroticism. The Carnegie Mellon study, drawing on elaborate computer records of online activity, was able to measure for the first time what people actually download, rather than what they say they want to see. "We now know what the consumers of computer pornography really look at in the privacy of their own homes," says Marty Rimm, the study's principal investigator. "And we're finding a fundamental shift in the kinds of images they demand."

What the Carnegie Mellon researchers discovered was:

There's an awful lot of porn online. In an 18-month study, the team surveyed 917,410 sexually explicit pictures, descriptions, short stories and film clips. On those Usenet newsgroups where digitized images are stored, 83.5 percent of the pictures were pornographic.

It is immensely popular. Trading in sexually explicit imagery, according to the report, is now "one of the largest (if not the largest) recreational applications of users of computer networks." At one U.S. University, 13 of the 40 most frequently visited newsgroups had names like alt.sex.stories, rec.arts.erotica and alt.sex.bondage.

It is a big moneymaker. The great majority (71 percent) of the sexual images on the newsgroups surveyed originate from adult-oriented computer bulletin-board systems (BBS) whose operators are trying to lure customers to their private collections of X-rated material. There are thousands of these BBS services, which charge fees (typically \$10 to \$30 a month) and take credit cards; the five largest have annual revenues in excess of \$1 million.

It is ubiquitous. Using data obtained with permission from BBS operators, the Carnegie Mellon team identified (but did not publish the names of) individual consumers in more than 2,000 cities in all 50 states and 40 countries, territories and provinces around the world—including some countries like China, where possession of pornography can be a capital offense.

It is a guy thing. According to the BBS operators, 98.9 percent of the consumers of on-line porn are men. And there is some evidence that many of the remaining 1.1 percent are women paid to hang out on the "chat" rooms and bulletin boards to make the patrons feel more comfortable.

It is not just naked women. Perhaps because hard-core sex pictures are so widely available elsewhere, the adult BBS market seems to be driven largely by a demand for images that can't be found in the average magazine rack: pedophilia (nude photos of children), hebephilia (youths) and what the researchers call paraphilia—a grab bag of "deviant" material that includes images of bondage, sadoomasochism, urination, defecation, and sex acts with a barnyard full of animals.

The appearance of material like this on a public network accessible to men, women and children around the world raises issues too important to ignore—or to oversimplify. Parents have legitimate concerns about what their kids are being exposed to and, conversely, what those children might miss if their access to the Internet were cut off. Lawmakers must balance public safety with their obligation to preserve essential civil liberties. Men and women have to come to terms with what draws them to such images. And computer programmers have to come up with more enlightened ways to give users control over a network that is, by design, largely out of control.

The Internet, of course, is more than a place to find pictures of people having sex with dogs. It's a vast marketplace of ideas and information of all sorts—on politics, religion, science and technology. If the fast-growing World Wide Web fulfills its early promise, the network could be a powerful engine of economic growth in the 21st century. And as the Carnegie Mellon study is careful to point out, pornographic image files, despite their evident popularity, represent only about 3 percent of all the messages on the Usenet newsgroups, while the Usenet itself represents only 11.5 percent of the traffic on the Internet.

As shocking and, indeed, legally obscene as some of the online porn may be, the researchers found nothing that can't be found in specialty magazines or adult bookstores. Most of the material offered by the private BBS services, in fact, is simply scanned from existing print publications.

But pornography is different on the computer networks. You can obtain it in the privacy of your home—without having to walk into a seedy bookstore or movie house. You can download only those things that turn you on, rather than buy an entire magazine or video. You can explore different aspects of your sexuality without exposing yourself to communicable diseases or public ridicule. (Unless, of course, someone gets hold of the computer files tracking your online activities, as happened earlier this year to a couple dozen crimson-faced Harvard students.)

The great fear of parents and teachers, of course, is not that college students will find this stuff but that it will fall into the hands of those much younger—including some, perhaps, who are not emotionally prepared to make sense of what they see.

Ten-year-old Anders Urmacher, a student at the Dalton School in New York City who likes to hang out with other kids in the Treehouse chat room on America Online, got E-mail from a stranger that contained a mysterious file with instructions for how to download it. He followed the instructions, and then he called his mom. When Linda Mann-Urmacher opened the file, the computer screen filled with 10 thumbnail-size pictures showing couples engaged in various acts of sodomy, heterosexual intercourse and

lesbian sex. "I was not aware that this stuff was online," says a shocked Mann-Urmacher. "Children should not be subjected to these images."

This is the flip side of Vice President Al Gore's vision of an information super-highway linking every school and library in the land. When the kids are plugged in, will they be exposed to the seamiest sides of human sexuality? Will they fall prey to child molesters hanging out in electronic chat rooms? It's precisely these fears that have stopped Bonnie Fell of Skokie, Illinois, from signing up for the Internet access her three boys say they desperately need.

"They could get bombarded with X-rated porn, and I wouldn't have any idea," she says. Mary Veed, a mother of three from nearby Hinsdale, makes a point of trying to keep up with her computer-literate 12-year-old, but sometimes has to settle for monitoring his phone bill. "Once they get to be a certain age, boys don't always tell Mom what they do," she says.

"We face a unique, disturbing and urgent circumstance, because it is children who are the computer experts in our nation's families," said Republican Senator Dan Coats of Indiana during the debate over the controversial anti-cyberporn bill he co-sponsored with Senator Exon.

According to at least one of those experts—16-year-old David Slifka of Manhattan—the danger of being bombarded with unwanted pictures is greatly exaggerated. "If you don't want them you won't get them," says the veteran Internet surfer. Private adult BBSs require proof of age (usually a driver's license) and are off-limits to minors, and kids have to master some fairly daunting computer science before they can turn so-called binary files on the Usenet into high-resolution color pictures. "The chances of randomly coming across them are unbelievably slim," says Slifka.

While groups like the Family Research Council insist that online child molesters represent a clear and present danger, there is no evidence that it is any greater than the thousand other threats children face every day. Ernie Allen, executive director of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, acknowledges that there have been 10 or 12 "fairly high-profile cases" in the past year of children being seduced or lured online into situations where they are victimized. Kids who are not online are also at risk, however; more than 800,000 children are reported missing every year in the U.S.

Yet it is in the name of the children and their parents that lawmakers are racing to fight cyberporn. The first blow was struck by Senators Exon and Coats, who earlier this year introduced revisions to an existing law called the Communications Decency Act. The idea was to extend regulations written to govern the dial-a-porn industry into the computer networks. The bill proposed to outlaw obscene material and impose fines of up to \$100,000 and prison terms of up to two years on anyone who knowingly makes "indecent" material available to children under 18.

The measure had problems from the start. In its original version it would have made online-service providers criminally liable for any obscene communications that passed through their systems—a provision that, given the way the networks operate, would have put the entire Internet at risk. Exon and Coats revised the bill but left in place the language about using "indecent" words online. "It's a frontal assault on the First Amendment," says Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe. Even veteran prosecutors ridicule it. "It won't pass scrutiny even in misdemeanor court," says one.

The Exon bill had been written off for dead only a few weeks ago. Republican Senator

Larry Pressler of South Dakota, chairman of the Commerce committee, which has jurisdiction over the larger telecommunications-reform act to which it is attached, told Time that he intended to move to table it.

That was before Exon showed up in the Senate with his "blue book." Exon had asked a friend to download some of the rawer images available online. "I knew it was bad," he says. "But then when I got on there, it made Playboy and Hustler look like Sunday-school stuff." He had the images printed out, stuffed them in a blue folder and invited his colleagues to stop by his desk on the Senate floor to view them. At the end of the debate—which was carried live on c-span—few Senators wanted to cast a nationally televised vote that might later be characterized as pro-pornography. The bill passed 84 to 16.

Civil libertarians were outraged. Mike Godwin, staff counsel for the Electronic Frontier Foundation, complained that the indecency portion of the bill would transform the vast library of the Internet into a children's reading room, where only subjects suitable for kids could be discussed. "It's government censorship," said Marc Rotenberg of the Electronic Privacy Information Center. "The Amendment shouldn't end where the Internet begins."

The key issue, according to legal scholars, is whether the Internet is a print medium (like a newspaper), which enjoys strong protection against government interference, or a broadcast medium (like television), which may be subject to all sorts of government control. Perhaps the most significant import of the Exon bill, according to EFF's Godwin, is that it would place the computer networks under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, which enforces, among other rules, the injunction against using the famous seven dirty words on the radio. In a Time/CNN poll of 1,000 Americans conducted last week by Yankelovich Partners, respondents were sharply split on the issue: 42 percent were for FCC-like control over sexual content on the computer networks; 48 percent were against it.

By week's end the balance between protecting speech and curbing pornography seemed to be tipping back toward the libertarians. In a move that surprised conservative supporters, House Speaker Newt Gingrich denounced the Exon amendment. "It is clearly a violation of free speech, and it's a violation of the right of adults to communicate with each other," he told a caller on a cable-TV show. It was a key defection, because Gingrich will preside over the computer-decency debate when it moves to the House in July. Meanwhile, two U.S. Representatives, Republican Christopher Cox of California and Democrat Ron Wyden of Oregon, were putting together an anti-Exon amendment that would bar federal regulation of the Internet and help parents find ways to block material they found objectionable.

Coincidentally, in the closely watched case of a University of Michigan student who published a violent sex fantasy on the Internet and was charged with transmitting a threat to injure or kidnap across state lines, a federal judge in Detroit last week dismissed the charges. The judge ruled that while Jake Baker's story might be deeply offensive, it was not a crime.

How the Carnegie Mellon report will affect the delicate political balance on the cyberporn debate is anybody's guess. Conservatives thumbing through it for rhetorical ammunition will find plenty. Appendix B lists the most frequently downloaded files from a popular adult BBS, providing both the download count and the two-line descriptions posted by the board's operator. Suffice it to say that they all end in exclamation

points, many include such phrases as "nailed to a table!" and none can be printed in Time.

How accurately these images reflect America's sexual interests, however, is a matter of some dispute. University of Chicago sociologist Edward Laumann, whose 1994 Sex in America survey painted a far more humdrum picture of America's sex life, says the Carnegie Mellon study may have captured what he calls the "gaper phenomenon." "There is a curiosity for things that are extraordinary and way out," he says. "It's like driving by a horrible accident. No one wants to be in it, but we all slow down to watch."

Other sociologists point out that the difference between the Chicago and Carnegie Mellon reports may be more apparent than real. Those 1 million or 2 million people who download pictures from the Internet represent a self-selected group with an interest in erotica. The Sex in America respondents, by contrast, were a few thousand people selected to represent a cross section of all American. Still, the new research is a gold mine for psychologists, social scientists, computer marketers and anybody with an interest in human boards, they left a digital trail of their transactions, allowing the pornographers to compile data bases about their buying habits and sexual tastes. The more sophisticated operators were able to adjust their inventory and their descriptions to match consumer demand.

Nobody did this more effectively than Robert Thomas, owner of the Amateur Action BBS in Milpitas, California, and a kind of modern-day Marquis de Sade, according to the Carnegie Mellon report. He is currently serving time in an obscenity case that may be headed for the Supreme Court.

Thomas, whose BBS is the online-porn market leader, discovered that he could boost sales by trimming soft- and hard-core images from his data base while front-loading his files with pictures of sex acts with animals (852) and nude prepubescent children (more than 5,000), his two most popular categories of porn. He also used copywriting tricks to better serve his customers' fantasies. For example, he described more than 1,200 of his pictures as depicting sex scenes between family members (father and daughter, mother and son), even though there was no evidence that any of the participants were actually related. These "incest" images were among his biggest sellers, accounting for 10 percent of downloads.

The words that worked were sometimes quite revealing. Straightforward oral sex, for example, generally got a lukewarm response. But when Thomas described the same images using words like choke or choking, consumer demand doubled.

Such findings may cheer antipornography activists; as feminist writer Andrea Dworkin puts it, "the whole purpose of pornography is to hurt women." Catharine MacKinnon, a professor of law at the University of Michigan, goes further. Women are doubly violated by pornography, she writes in *Vindication and Resistance*, one of three essays in the forthcoming Georgetown Law Journal that offer differing views on the Carnegie Mellon report. They are violated when it is made and exposed to further violence again and again every time it is consumed. "The question pornography poses in cyberspace," she writes, "is the same one it poses everywhere else: Whether anything will be done about it."

But not everyone agrees with Dworkin and MacKinnon, by any means; even some feminist think there is a place in life—and the Internet—for erotica. In her new book, *Defending Pornography*, Nadine Strossen argues that censoring sexual expression would

do women more harm than good, undermining their equality, their autonomy and their freedom.

The Justice Department, for its part, has not asked for new antiporn legislation. Distributing obscene material across state lines is already illegal under federal law, and child pornography in particular is vigorously prosecuted. Some 40 people in 14 states were arrested two years ago in Operation Longarm for exchanging kiddie porn online. And one of the leading characters in the Carnegie Mellon study—a former Rand McNally executive named Robert Copella, who left book publishing to make his fortune selling pedophilia on the networks—was extradited from Tijuana, and is now awaiting sentencing in a New Jersey jail.

For technical reasons, it is extremely difficult to stamp out anything on the Internet—particularly images stored on the Usenet newsgroup. As Internet pioneer John Gilmore famously put it, “The Net interprets censorship as damage and routes around it.” There are border issues as well. Other countries on the Internet—France, for instance—are probably no more interested in having their messages screened by U.S. censors than Americans would be in having theirs screened by, say, the government of Saudi Arabia.

Historians say it should come as no surprise that the Internet—the most democratic of media—would lead to new calls for censorship. The history of pornography and efforts to suppress it are inextricably bound up with the rise of new media and the emergence of democracy. According to Walter Kendrick, author of *The Secret Museum: Pornography in Modern Culture*, the modern concept of pornography was invented in the 19th century by European gentlemen whose main concern was to keep obscene material away from women and the lower classes. Things got out of hand with the spread of literacy and education, which made pornography available to anybody who could read. Now, on the computer networks, anybody with a computer and a modem can not only consume pornography but distribute it as well. On the Internet, anybody can be Bob Guccione.

That might not be a bad idea, says Carlin Meyer, a professor at New York Law School whose Georgetown essay takes a far less apocalyptic view than MacKinnon's. She argues that if you don't like the images of sex the pornographers offer, the appropriate response is not to suppress them but to overwhelm them with healthier, more realistic ones. Sex on the Internet, she maintains, might actually be good for young people. “[Cyberspace] is a safe space in which to explore the forbidden and the taboo,” she writes. “It offers the possibility for genuine, unembarrassed conversations about accurate as well as fantasy images of sex.”

That sounds easier than it probably is. Pornography is powerful stuff, and as long as there is demand for it, there will always be a supply. Better software tools may help check the worst abuses, but there will never be a switch that will cut it off entirely—not without destroying the unbridled expression that is the source of the Internet's (and democracy's) greatest strength. The hard truth, says John Perry Barlow, co-founder of the EFF and father of three young daughters, is that the burden ultimately falls where it always has: on the parents. “If you don't want your children fixating on filth,” he says, “better step up to the tough task of raising them to find it as distasteful as you do yourself.”

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Iowa, whose usual good judgment has never been questioned by this individual. I thank him very much for addressing this matter.

I, too, read the article that he referenced in *Time* magazine. I got in on just the end of his remarks.

May I inquire of my friend from Iowa, did he have printed in the *RECORD* that portion of the *Time* magazine article from this morning's *Time* magazine?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe he did.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

If it was not referenced, I would reference the graphic picture on the front of *Time* magazine today, which I think puts into focus very distinctly and directly what my friend from Iowa and this Senator has been talking about for a long, long time.

I would also reference for the *RECORD* and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD*, interestingly enough, simultaneously a similar story along the same lines that appeared in this morning's weekly edition of *Newsweek* magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From *Newsweek*, July 3, 1995]

NO PLACE FOR KIDS?

A PARENT'S GUIDE TO SEX ON THE NET

(By Steven Levy)

When the annals of cyberspace are uploaded for future generations, digital historians will undoubtedly include a scene from the Senate chamber earlier this month: Nebraska Democrat James Exon brandishing a thin binder now known as the blue book. Inside were images snatched from the shadows and thrust into the center of public discourse. Women bound and being burned by cigarettes. Pierced with swords. Having sex with a German shepherd. As Exon puts it, images that are “repulsive and far off base.” Images from the Net.

Exon compiled his blue book to persuade his Senate colleagues to pass his Communications Decency Act. Partially moved by a private showing in the Senate cloakroom, they did so, overwhelmingly. It is not clear whether the act, which places strict limits on all speech in computer networks, will find its way into law, but its Senate passage was a transforming blow against the Internet empire. Even the most vehement of the Internet's defenders now face a real problem: how to maintain free speech when well-chronicled excesses give the impression that much of cyberspace is a cesspool.

Indeed, most of the dispatches from the electronic world these days seem to dwell on the dark side. The most prevalent type of anecdote involves someone like Susan Tilghman, a medical doctor in Fairfax, Va. Last fall she hooked the family computer to America Online (AOL). Her sons, 12 and 15 years old, enjoyed it so much that she and her husband sought to find out why. Clicking on files their boys had read, the astonished parents found “pornographic pictures in full color,” says Tilghman, “We were horrified.” She pulled the modem plug immediately.

Then there are the actual busts of online pornographic rings. Just as in the physical world, traffic in obscene material is illegal in cyberspace, and authorities are beginning

to prosecute zealously. The most recent raid occurred last week in Cincinnati, targeting not only purveyors of porn but more than 100 individuals who had allegedly downloaded pornographic images of children via AOL.

Most disturbing of all are the tales of sexual predators using the Internet and commercial online services to spirit children away from their keyboards. Until now parents have believed that no physical harm could possibly result when their progeny were huddled safely in the bedroom or den, tapping on the family computer. But then came news of cases like the 13-year-old Kentucky girl found in Los Angeles after supposedly being lured by a grown-up cyberpal.

These reports have triggered a sort of parental panic about cyberspace. Parents are rightfully confused, faced with hard choices about whether to expose their children to the alleged benefits of cyberspace when carnal pitfalls lie ahead. As our culture moves unrelentingly toward the digital realm, some questions—and answers—are finally coming into focus.

HOW MUCH SEX IS THERE IN CYBERSPACE?

A lot. Brian Reid, director of the Network Systems Laboratory at Digital Equipment Corp., reports that one of the most popular of the thousands of Usenet discussion groups is the “alt.sex” group. He estimates that on a monthly basis between 180,000 and 500,000 users drop in. A glance at some World Wide Web sites shows that while the digital home of the Smithsonian Institution took seven weeks to gather 1.9 million visits, or “hits,” Playboy's electronic headquarters received 4.7 million hits in a seven-day period last month.

And this week the Georgetown Law Journal will release a survey headed by Marty Rimm, a 30-year-old researcher at Carnegie Mellon University. In his paper, “Marketing Pornography on the Information Superhighway,” Rimm concentrated mostly on adults-only bulletin boards (the equivalent of X-rated bookshops). He provides solid evidence that there's loads of hard-core stuff in cyberspace. Rimm wrote a computer program to analyze descriptions of 917,410 dirty pictures (he examined about 10,000 actual images, to check the reliability of the descriptions). His conclusion: “I think there's almost no question that we're seeing an unprecedented availability and demand of material like sadomasochism, bestiality, vaginal and rectal fisting, eroticized urination . . . and pedophilia.”

HOW EASY IS IT TO AVOID THE SEXUAL MATERIAL?

Donna Rice Hughes (yes, that Donna Rice), spokesperson for an anti-pornography group called Enough is Enough!, claims that “children are going online innocently and naively running across material that's illegal even for adults.” But the way the Internet works, that sort of stuff doesn't tend to pop up uninvited. “When you watch TV it comes right to you,” says Donna Hoffman, associate professor of business at Vanderbilt University. “But on the Internet, you're in an environment with 30 million channels. It's up to you to decide where to go. You don't have to download the images on alt.sex.binaries.”

Groups with “binaries” are the picture files, the ones containing the most shocking images. To find them, one needs a good sense of digital direction. Depending on the software you have, you may need a mastery of some codes in the notoriously arcane Unix computer language, or it can involve a few well-chosen clicks of the mouse. In any case, there's no way you get that stuff by accident.

Kids are very hungry to view sexual materials, and left to their own devices they will

find that the Internet provides them with an unprecedented bonanza. In predigital days, getting one's hands on hot pictures required running an often impenetrable gantlet of drugstore clerks and newsstand operators, and finding really hardcore material was out of the question. Not so with the Net. Frank Moretti, associate headmaster of the Dalton School in New York City, which offers Internet access beginning in junior high, thinks that we can deal with that. "There's a candy store around the corner from our school that has just about every kind of pornographic image," he says. "The challenge is to help our children use self-discipline."

IS THE INTERNET A HAVEN FOR PREDATORS?

After years of online activity, "there have been about a dozen high-profile cases," says Ernie Allen, president of the Arlington, Va.-based National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. "It's not a huge number, but it does indicate that there are risks. But there are risks in everything a child does. Our concern is the nature of the technology. It creates a false sense of security."

What parents should warn kids about is the classic scenario described by Detective Bill Dorn, head of the Sexually Exploited Child Unit of the Los Angeles Police Department: "The pervert can get on any bulletin board and chat with kids all night long. He lies about his age and makes friends. As soon as he can get a telephone number or address, he's likely to look up the kid and molest him or her." In real life, this hardly ever happens. Most online services have policies to monitor chat rooms, particularly those designated as "kids-only." No guarantees, but not many kidnappers.

And if the child is propositioned? "It happens, but it's less upsetting if a child is prepared for it," says Sherry Turkle, an MIT professor whose coming book, "Life on the Screen," includes data about the experiences of nearly 300 kids on the Net. "Better to warn the child and instruct him to say, 'I'm not interested,' and just leave."

All the publicity about predators has tarnished the image of chat rooms. But the talk areas may have value. "Kids are finding ways to experiment with self-presentation," says Turkle. She's talked with kids about "Net sex," where kids dabble in interactive erotica like this:

I'm kissing you.

You fondle my hair.

I fondle your breast.

Sometimes there is conscious gender-swapping. Sometimes things go farther than the kids intended. Still, Turkle thinks that there may be benefits in this; after all, no one gets pregnant in cyberspace. "Adolescence used to be a timeout, sexually speaking," she says. "But in the age of AIDS, sexual experimentation is a deadly game. The Internet is becoming a way to play with identity, where adolescents can develop a sense of themselves."

CAN NEW LAWS SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESS THE PROBLEM?

The Exon amendment is very broad. It could hamper communication between adults—the essence of online activity—and might not even solve the problems that kids face. "It would be a mistake to drive us, in a moment of hysteria, to a solution that is unconstitutional, would stultify technology, and wouldn't even fulfill its mission," argues * * * Berman, director of the Center for Democracy and Technology.

But Berman and others have a secret weapon: the House of Representatives. "There's a generational difference between the House and Senate," says Berman. "They understand the technology and they're not afraid of it." The only question was whether this pro-technology impulse, along with a loath-

ing for government regulation, would lead Speaker Newt Gingrich and his minions to defy their allies in the religious right, whose "Contract With the American Family" calls for "protecting children from exposure to pornography on the Internet."

The question was answered last Tuesday night when a caller on a cable-TV talk show asked Gingrich what he thought of Exon's amendment. "I think it has no meaning and no real impact . . .," the speaker said. "It is clearly a violation of free speech and it's a violation of the rights of adults to communicate with each other."

But that was not the worst news for would-be monitors of cyberspace. Conservative Republican Chris Cox of California has teamed with liberal Democrat Ron Wyden of Oregon to develop the grandiosely entitled Internet Freedom and Family Empowerment Act. Basically, the bill would forbid the federal government from creating any regulatory agency to govern the Internet, relying instead on a variety of means (not yet determined) to protect children. Cox hopes that such legislation will encourage a free-market solution to cybersex from . . . more new technology.

CAN HIGH-TECH SOLUTIONS HELP?

Ultimately, James Exon's greatest contribution to the protection of children may not be his legislation but the fear of it has created in Silicon Valley and its virtual environments. Already parents can buy some sophisticated software to block children's access to questionable material. More is on the way; two weeks ago Microsoft, Netscape and the Progressive Networks joined together to develop new prophylactic devices. "The Exon amendment certainly raised consciousness," says Mike Homer of Netscape. "But we believe there is a variety of fairly straightforward tools that would allow us to self-regulate." More than 100 companies have called, asking to help. Another, paragraph complementary, scheme in the works is KidCode, a means by which the addresses on the World Wide Web will have voluntary ratings embedded. "Places that provide erotica on the Internet are wild about the idea of voluntary ratings," says Nathaniel Borenstein, designer of KidCode. "They don't want to sell to kids."

Meanwhile, one solution has already hit the market: SurfWatch, created by an eponymous Silicon Valley firm. Its software works by matching a potential Net destination to a proprietary list of forbidden sites. In addition, the \$50 software package looks for objectionable language. Once parents or educators install it, they have at least one line of defense. "This is the kind of software that can offer the individual choice as opposed to censorship," says SurfWatch vice president Jay Friendland.

Last week a bogus press release circulated on the Net for a fictional product called Babe Watch that "looks exactly like SurfWatch but instead of blocking access, actually goes out and locates Web sites with good pictures of babes." Undoubtedly a real-life version is in the works. "If you're a 16-year-old A-quality hacker, you'll be able to turn us off," says Friendland.

WILL THE PROBLEM EVER GO AWAY?

The bottom line when it comes to kids, sex and the Internet is that no matter what laws we pass and what high-tech solutions we devise, the three of them together will never be less volatile than the first two alone. We can mitigate but not eliminate the drawbacks of high tech; there's no way to get its benefits without them.

It's a trade-off that Patricia Shao understands. About six weeks ago, her 13-year-old daughter, visiting a friend, was in an online-service chat room when they were propositioned to have "cybersex." Shao was

shocked, and even more so when her daughter casually told her, "This is what happens when we're online." "They thought it was just a crackpot," says Shao, a Bethesda, Md., marketing executive. Instead of pulling the cyberplug, however, Shao took pains to educate herself about online sex. She even engaged in some political activism, signing on with a pro-Exon anti-pornography group. And ultimately, Shao's family purchased its own America Online subscription after her daughter's close encounter with a pixilated stranger.

If there were more built-in programs like SurfWatch available to her, Shao says, she'd probably use them. But in the meantime she is making do with the more old-fashioned method of talking to her kids—and trusting them. "I've warned my children about the obscene material out there, and I trust them not to access it." As careful parents will do, she monitors the family online activity somewhat, by tracking the hours they are logged on. But as with other passages—going out alone, driving a car—ultimately, you have to let kids grow up. Even if some of the growing up happens online.

Mr. EXON. The story Newsweek tells is not dissimilar. Alarming facts have been brought out into the open even further with the publication in these two national magazines. The Newsweek article is entitled "Sex Online: What Parents Should Know."

I very much appreciate having the time to take a look at the legislation the Senator from Iowa has introduced. I do not know how it is significantly different from the measure that was introduced by Senator COATS and myself, known as the Decency Act, and approved on the Senate floor by a vote of 86 to 14, if I remember it correctly.

I simply say, this is an ongoing battle. If we have not done anything else, I hope all will recognize today at least Americans know that there is a real, real problem, primarily with regard to our children, our innocent children—at least as we like to think of them.

It seems to me all of the profit-making motives are now sizing the Internet to make money on, and I applaud the efforts of the Senator from Iowa and the legislation that he just indicated he intended to introduce with regard to crime taking over a more important part of the Internet. That happens wherever there is an exciting new development.

Once again, I emphasize this Senator has followed with keen interest the development of the Internet. It so happens this Senator probably is one of the few Members of this body who was on the original Internet. The original Internet, the only thing like it, was the amateur radio network that I became involved as a very young lad, 16 or 17 years old, growing up in Lake Andes, SD, and I communicated, dit-dit da-dit, with people all over the United States. Of course you had to have a license to be an amateur radio operator; you had to pass certain tests. I guess no one ever thought about that first Internet being used for the purposes that this Internet is being used.

Nevertheless, as the senior member of the Armed Services Committee I was very much involved in the Internet development. Some people wonder where

did the Internet come from? It came from and was borne by taxpayers' dollars, out of the national defense budget. It spread far beyond that at this time, and I certainly say and emphasize once again, I am a strong supporter of the Internet, the information superhighway. But for a long, long time, beginning seriously a little over a year ago, I began to develop legislation that would hopefully make the information superhighway a safer highway for kids and families to travel. The legislation that was passed by the Senate on a 86 to 14 vote within the last week or so was a follow-on to a proposal that I addressed and attached to the telecommunications bill out of the Commerce Committee last year.

The concept of all of these has been to make a constructive suggestion, recognizing constitutional rights. Like that portion referred to by the Senator from Iowa, the measure crafted by myself and Senator COATS and our staffs, with the help of an awful lot of people, does provide protection, constitutional guarantees oftentimes supported by the courts in a whole series of areas including the laws that we have always had regarding obscenity on the telephone lines and also laws similarly against transportation of pornographic and obscene materials through the U.S. mail. Further, our law incorporates the protections under the first amendment that have been argued out and thoroughly discussed and held by the courts under the Dial-a-Porn statutes, which is another form of pornography.

It is safe to say, the issue has been engaged. I think that is for the good. Once again, I cannot speak for my cosponsor, Senator COATS, or any cosponsor of the measure that passed the Senate, but this Senator simply says I am willing to listen to any improvements or changes that should be made in this bill. But I certainly am not going to stand by and see it watered down to the place where it is totally meaningless.

Therefore, I say I think we have accomplished a great deal by clearly, for the first time, illuminating and bringing this to the attention of parents of the United States of America. And parents still are required, I suggest, to play a key role in how we develop this and how it is administered. But the parents, I think, cannot do it alone. Therefore, I hope we can continue to work together in a constructive fashion and not listen to the voices that simply say, "I want what I want when I want it on the Internet and I don't care what ill effect that might have on kids."

We have to continue to work together. I hope there is a way to solve this problem for the good of all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

The Senator from New Mexico is advised we have 1 more minute remaining in morning business.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to

speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCIENCE EDUCATION

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes here this morning to oppose cuts for science education that were made June 20, in the House Appropriations Committee, related to the Energy Department. Congress is engaged in an important process to reduce the Federal budget and I support that process. I recognize very difficult choices will have to be made. But I want to be sure, to the extent I can, that the process remains thoughtful and maintains our national commitment to improvement in education and our national investment in education, at the same time that we proceed toward a balanced budget. Cuts being proposed for science education in the Department of Energy appropriation do not meet that test of thoughtfulness and support for investment in education.

In 1989, President Bush met with the 50 Governors throughout this country in an education summit in Charlottesville, VA. That was a historic occasion because for the first time the Governors and the President met together to discuss that important issue of how to improve education in the country.

In 1990, they published goals for this country, and one of those goals, which I believe was an extremely important goal for us to commit ourselves to, was the goal of making this country first in the world in math and science education by the year 2000. This is the backdrop against which we need to judge what we are doing in this appropriations process here in the Congress in these weeks.

I am told that the House appropriations bill, that I referred to before, significantly reduces the \$160 million for science education embedded in various parts of the Department of Energy, and it eliminates altogether the funding for two line items which are focused entirely on education. Those two line items are:

First, the University and Science Education Program in the Department of Energy Office of Science Education and Technical Information. The House appropriations mark for this program has reduced the funding from the proposed \$55 million, which the President asked for in his budget, to absolutely zero.

The second of these two line items is the Department of Energy Technology Transfer and Education Program for Department of Energy Office of Defense Programs. The House mark for this program was reduced from \$249 million in fiscal year 1996—that was the proposed level—to \$15 million, including a cut to zero funding for the \$20 million line item earmarked for science education at our three national weapons laboratories.

Obviously, Mr. President, this is of concern to me because this directly affects two of those national laboratories in my home State of New Mexico, Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories.

First, let me describe the impact of the elimination of the Science Education and Technical Information Program. This cut eliminates the central coordinating and evaluation mechanism for all of the Department of Energy education activities, which is the Office of Science Education and Technical Information. In eliminating this office, Congress would eliminate the administrative infrastructure for other Department of Energy science education offices' programs, the only Department of Energy office in which education is not just an ancillary function.

In addition, this cut would eliminate the laboratory cooperative science centers, which leverage the much larger investment in science and technology expertise residing in the Department of Energy Laboratory System. These centers connect thousands of students and teachers each year in high schools, colleges, and graduate programs with scientists at our Department of Energy laboratories. The centers provide training and mentoring, and hands-on laboratory experiences both at the laboratories themselves and at local public schools and universities. They provide internships, faculty research opportunities, and professional development enhancements and lab-school partnerships. They also help support the Department of Energy's scientists' participation in a variety of State and local systemic education reform activities, such as the National Science Foundation's State systemic reform initiatives.

These cuts will weaken the pipeline of well-trained scientists supported by the 73 percent of programs funds that go to universities to train future engineers, technicians, and scientists for current and future work force needs. They will eliminate Department of Energy work to support and strengthen the caliber of science and math education at the secondary and at the college levels, and the 1996 priorities for work force development, systemic education reform, science literacy, evaluation, and dissemination.

Mr. President, the Department of Energy education cuts will have a particularly damaging effect for those who benefit from the education activities of Sandia National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory in my home State of New Mexico.

First, they will suffer education cuts as part of the centers that I just described. Second, they will also suffer the loss of their part of the additional \$20 million for education programs concentrated at Sandia, Los Alamos, and at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, the Nation's three weapons laboratories.